UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1991/SR.12
5 June 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1991

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 12th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 30 May 1991, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. ELIASSON (Sweden)

CONTENTS

Elections and nominations (continued)

World social situation

Social development

Advancement of women

Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

ELECTIONS AND NOMINATIONS (continued)

Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund

The PRESIDENT announced the results of the second ballot for candidates from the group of Eastern European States to the Executive Board of UNICEF.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Invalid ballots:	0
Valid ballots:	54
Abstentions:	0
Members voting:	54
Majority required:	28
Number of votes obtained:	
USSR:	31
Bulgaria:	23

Having obtained the required majority, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was declared elected to the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund for a three-year term beginning 1 August 1991.

International Narcotics Control Board (E/1991/49)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect five members of the International Narcotics Control Board from candidates nominated by Members of the United Nations and Parties to the Single Convention which were not Members of the United Nations, in accordance with article 9, paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a) and (b) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the 1972 Protocol. He also drew attention to paragraph 3 of article 9.

(The President)

The Secretariat had been informed by the Chairman of the Asian Group that the candidacies of Sirad Atmodjo (Indonesia), A. R. Khandakar (Bangladesh) and A. Sadique (Bangladesh) had been withdrawn.

The Chairman of the Eastern European Group had also informed the Secretariat that the candidacies of Miloslav Krsiak (Czechoslovakia), Constantin Popescu (Romania) and Vido Popadic (Yugoslavia) had been withdrawn.

The Chairman of the Latin American and Caribbean Group had informed the Secretariat that the candidacy of Ernesto de la Guardia (Argentina) had been withdrawn and that the candidature of Manuel Quijano Narezo (Mexico) had been endorsed by that Group.

The Secretariat had been informed by the Chairman of the Western European and Other States Group that the candidacies of Kenneth William Edmondson (Australia), Sükrü Elekdag (Turkey), Christos Kiropoulos (Greece) and David Scicluna (Malta) had been withdrawn.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Kuntjoro Jakti (Indonesia) and Mr. Svetlozar Panov (Bulgaria) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	52
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	52
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	52
Required majority:	27

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Okun (United States of America)	30
Mr. Machata (Austria)	29
Mr. Martin (Thailand)	27
Mr. Quijano Narezo (Mexico)	27
Mr. Polimeni (Italy)	25
Mr. Ali Khan (Pakistan)	23

Mr. Queneudec (France)	20
Mr. Bulaev (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)	12
Mr. Fantohou (Togo)	9
Mr. Zapatero (Spain)	8
Mr. Bayer (Hungary)	6
Mr. Elmi (Somalia)	6
Mr. Oyakhilome (Nigeria)	6
Mr. Sangaré (Guinea)	5
Mr. Abushama (Sudan)	4
Mr. Abdel Rahman (Sudan)	3
Mr. Dinga (Congo)	3
Mr. Gonzalez (Philippines)	3
Mr. Karugaba (Uganda)	3
Mr. Wieniawski (Poland)	2

Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Okun (United States of America), Mr. Machata (Austria), Mr. Martin (Thailand) and Mr. Quijano Narezo (Mexico) were elected members of the International Narcotics Control Board for a term beginning 1 March 1992.

The PRESIDENT said that, as one seat remained to be filled, a second ballot would be conducted between Mr. Polimeni (Italy) and Mr. Ali Khan (Pakistan) in accordance with rule 69 of the rules of procedure of the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Kuntjoro Jakti (Indonesia) and Mr. Svetlozar Panov (Bulgaria) acted as tellers.

A second vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Number of invalid ballots:	1
Number of valid ballots:	53
Number of abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	53
Required majority:	27

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Ali Khan (Pakistan) 30

Mr. Polimeni (Italy) 23

Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Ali Khan (Pakistan) was elected as a member of the International Narcotics Control Board for a term beginning 1 March 1992.

WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION (E/1991/84)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Second (Social) Committee issued in document E/1991/84. In paragraph 20, the Committee had recommended the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Draft resolution I

Draft resolution I was adopted without a vote.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that, in the spirit of compromise, his delegation had joined in the consensus adoption of the resolution, but had done so with reservations. His delegation had welcomed the new tone of the Secretary-General's interim report, noting that it reflected the new economic trends at work. However, other delegations had criticized it for the same reason. The resolution just adopted implicitly criticized the report for taking a more realistic approach to the world social situation and economic factors affecting it. The Secretary-General had not strayed from the established terms of reference, and should not be criticized for pursuing a more balanced approach. His delegation awaited the publication of the 1993 report with great interest, and hoped that it would reflect objective scholarship.

Draft resolution II

Mrs. LIMJUCO (Observer for the Philippines) said that her delegation had joined the list of co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

Mr. ALI (Iraq) said that the crisis involving Iraqi refugees and displaced persons resulted from an external conspiracy against Iraq following the Gulf War cease-fire, and from the intervention of several countries with imperialist designs in the internal affairs of Iraq with the aim of ensuring the failure of the current regime. Infiltration had also occurred from

(Mr. Ali, Iraq)

neighbouring countries, using arms and money from the large countries, to attempt to destabilize the regime and create chaos.

Iraq had welcomed United Nations and specialized agency efforts to settle the problem of displaced persons quickly, and had extended every facility to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General so that those persons could return home with dignity. It was thus effectively cooperating with the United Nations to settle the problem, and it rejected all attempts to exploit the situation of the displaced persons to give an international character to the crisis on the pretext of granting them due protection.

Paragraph 8 of the resolution appeared to equate the problem of displaced Iraqis with that of the Palestinians displaced from their homeland by foreign occupation, in that the Secretary-General had been asked to submit interim reports. However, the problem in Iraq was temporary and should be resolved within weeks or even days. A major step in that direction would be the lifting of economic sanctions against Iraq, in order to end the suffering of the entire Iraqi people. If implementation of the memorandum of understanding between Iraq and the United Nations had been speeded up, the refugees could have returned to their homeland with all due dignity.

Draft resolution II was adopted without a vote.

Mr. BRITO CRUZ (Brazil) said that his delegation expressed its solidarity with the sufferings of Iraqi refugees and displaced persons. The draft resolution was important as a means of raising awareness and enhancing international cooperation to alleviate their plight. The action to that end should be understood more in the light of norms of international humanitarian law than in the context of basic norms of international law governing relations among States. Adoption of the draft resolution could not be construed as implying that all actions taken to deal with the situation faced by Iraqi refugees could be regarded as a valid legal precedent or model applicable to relations among States.

Draft decision I

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft decision contained in paragraph 21 of E/1991/85.

The decision was adopted without a vote.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (E/1991/85, E/1991/26)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Second (Social) Committee on social development. In paragraph 41 of E/1991/85, the Committee recommended the adoption of 11 draft resolutions.

Draft resolutions I to IX

Draft resolutions I to IX were adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution X

The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that, while his delegation approved the spirit of cooperation and flexibility which had been demonstrated, it would have preferred not to have a resolution on crime prevention, because the entire programme was subject to review by the Intergovernmental Working Group. His delegation was also concerned about the process whereby the conclusions of the Eighth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, as referred to in the fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph 2 of the resolution, had been reached.

Draft resolution XI

Draft resolution XI was adopted without a vote.

Draft decisions I to V

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the five draft decisions recommended for adoption in paragraph 42 of E/1991/85.

Draft decisions I to IV were adopted without a vote.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision V.

Draft decision V was adopted without a vote.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that his delegation welcomed the constructive spirit of the informal consultations, but believed that consideration of the convening of a world summit for social development should have taken place in the Committee on Social Development, and that the draft decision was, therefore, inappropriate. His Government would participate in the discussions, but dissociated itself from the adoption of the decision.

ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (E/1991/87, E/1991/28)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on nine draft resolutions which the Second (Social) Committee recommended for adoption. Draft resolutions I to VII were contained in the report of the Commission on the Status of Women (E/1991/28).

Draft resolutions I and II

Draft resolutions I and II were adopted.

Draft resolution III

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted draft resolution III by a recorded vote of 36 to 1, with 10 abstentions.

Mr. TENNE (Israel) said the work of the Commission on the Status of Women was too important to be politicized and diverted from its vital purposes, yet that was exactly what happened when politically motivated resolutions such as draft resolution III were routinely rammed through the Commission and then through the Economic and Social Council.

The authentic concern of some delegations for the situation of Palestinian women should have led them to consider the causes of the situation and not merely its effects. The resolution was replete with falsehoods and distortions, except for one reference to the "harmful effects" of the intifadah on Palestinian women and children. No reference was made to the dozens of Palestinian women who were among the more than 450 Palestinians slain by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in the intifidah. Women had been singled out by the death squads of the PLO. Women in their ninth month of pregnancy had been stabbed to death and decapitated. Hundreds of women had been molested by PLO youths who demanded that they stop using cosmetics and dress "suitably". In some cases acid had been thrown at Arab women who failed to comply, grievously injuring them and disfiguring them for life.

In a part of the world where the status of women left much to be desired, Israel had introduced changes. Palestinian women, most of whom came from refugee camps and had previously worked in domestic service where they were misused or exploited, were now working in Israeli factories, which had given

(Mr. Tenne, Israel)

them a new sense of their own worth. Acting within the framework of the existing local law, the Israeli Administration had regulated working hours, assured the right not to be compelled to work night shifts, banned the employment of women in dangerous occupations and increased paid maternity leave from 21 to 45 days. Conditions of employment and social benefits for Palestinian women were now the same as those applying to men. Female school enrolment was quite high by Middle Eastern standards, with a little over 45 per cent of the primary and secondary school students being female.

The draft resolution was biased and its only real purpose was to discredit Israel. What Palestinian women actually needed was not another anti-Israel resolution but an end to the violence which had terrorized their lives and caused so much suffering.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution III.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Ecuador, Finland, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 42 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said his country deplored all acts of violence from any quarter and had repeatedly called for restraint by all parties. Israel as the occupying Power was obligated to adhere to the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention. The United States had criticized actions that were inconsistent with that Convention, while recognizing Israel's responsibility to maintain law and order in the occupied

(Mr. Marks, United States)

territories. The level of confrontation should be lowered and the problems solved by non-violent means.

The resolution presented a one-sided view of the difficult situation in the occupied territories. Like others before it, it included sweeping condemnations of Israeli policies and practices without regard to the cycle of violence that had taken so many Palestinian and Israeli lives. Such resolutions did not make a practical contribution to resolving the underlying problem but only deepened divisions. Nor would they ensure the legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people or the security of the State of Israel. The gap between Israelis and Palestinians must be closed and there could be no substitute for diplomacy. For that reason his Government had voted against the resolution.

Draft resolution IV

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted resolution IV by a recorded vote of 31 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution IV.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Ecuador, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Rwanda, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 37 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that no country had worked harder than his to end apartheid and no country was more firmly opposed to a system of government that stood in stark contrast to the principles of the Charter. The United States had also worked steadfastly for the full rights of women and children to lift the burden of apartheid from their lives. His country had been heartened by the considerable progress made by the international community in framing a practical realistic consensus on how a peaceful political evolution could take place in South Africa, and had worked on resolutions that set out those principles.

Thus it was with great regret that the United States had opposed the resolution. It had done so not because its opposition to apartheid had flagged but because the text included several formulations that fell back from the consensus resolution achieved at the last General Assembly, with the result that it failed to acknowledge either the existing consensus or the substantive progress that continued to be made in the dialogue under way in South Africa. The international community should avoid sending conflicting signals, and the resolution risked doing just that, which was at odds with the intention to encourage negotiations in South Africa.

Mr. BURCUOGLI (Turkey) said his country had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because it did not adequately reflect developments now under way in South Africa. Turkey was determined to contribute to efforts by the international community to dismantle the apartheid regime, which went against all human values.

Draft resolutions V to VII

Draft resolutions V to VII were adopted.

Draft resolutions VIII and IX

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolutions VIII and IX, which were contained in document E/1991/87.

Draft resolutions VIII and IX were adopted.

Draft decisions I and II

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decisions I and II, the texts of which were contained in document E/1991/28.

Draft decisions I and II were adopted.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SECOND DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (E/1991/39)

Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan) and Mrs. ARUNGU-OLENDE (Kenya) said that had they been present for the vote on draft resolution E/1991/L.19 on implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, they would have voted in favour.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.